



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

JANUARY, 1914

THE PRESIDENT'S VISION

IS IT TRUE OR IS IT ILLUSIVE?

BY THE EDITOR

There is but one cloud upon our horizon.—PRESIDENT WILSON.

So begins the year of Our Lord 1914, in the view of the head of the Nation. Is it a true vision or is it an illusion? Is its genesis to be found in the buoyancy of hope or in deductions from experience? A year hence we shall know. To-day we are restricted to conjecture. But, since prudence demands preparedness, let us pause for a moment at this milestone in our National progress and reflect upon conditions which seem to be alive with prospects of good and ill.

Turning our eyes from the blackness upon the Southern horizon to which the President refers, what do we behold? A really cloudless sky? If seemingly not, what are the portents to be recognized, to the end that evils may be averted? May not menace to National well-being lurk in possibilities such as these:

- (1) Subversion of the Constitution.
- (2) Foreign entanglements.
- (3) Business depression.
- (4) Class legislation.
- (5) Defeat of the Administration.

Here surely are clouds to be dispelled if the Republic, as

imaged by its founders, is to endure. But are they as dark with foreboding as they seem to be? May we not hope that, a year hence, they will have been effectually dispersed under the wise and firm guidance of a far-sighted Chief Magistrate? Consider in turn.

(1) Subversion of the Constitution.

"I feel confident," said the President to the Congress, "that I do not misinterpret the wishes or the expectations of the country when I urge the prompt enactment of legislation which will provide for primary elections throughout the country, at which the voters of the various parties may choose their nominees for the Presidency without the intervention of nominating conventions,"—and the Democratic Congress cheered loudly. It was a play to the People, to the Masses, to the Majority; it was appropriated boldly from the Progressives and was thought to be popular. That was all, but that was enough. The merits and demerits—for some there are—of the proposal called for no elucidation. To the mind of the President, and apparently to the minds of the Democrats in Congress, it was a subject which the President believed could be "handled promptly and without controversy of any kind." Therein, as the attitude manifested by the Press quickly showed, he erred. The revolution may be effected, but clearly not "without controversy of any kind." Too many persons, as sincere and patriotic as Mr. Wilson himself, gravely question both the advisability and the practicability of a change tending so pointedly from representative government to a pure democracy.

So, too, in our judgment, will misgivings arise in the minds of those cheering Southern Democrats when once they awake to the fact that Federal supervision of nominations inevitably involves Federal supervision of elections. Universal Presidential primaries may come, perhaps should come—we are not now discussing the proposition—but, if so, they will be realized through State, not through National, legislation. The South will see to that.

The disquieting feature of this suggestion lies not in its inherent quality, good or bad, but in the mode of its presentation. That one political party should steal a popular shibboleth from another is not surprising, but that a Democratic President should emulate a law-detesting rival for future honors in calmly ignoring the Constitution is as

amazing as it was obviously unexpected by the country. Surely Mr. Wilson must be aware, not only that our fundamental law affords no warrant for enactment of such legislation as he proposes, but also that the rights of the States in the premises have been upheld by the Courts over and over again. Clearly, if he felt it to be incumbent upon himself to urge a change, his proper course was to recommend the submission of an Amendment, thereby conforming strictly to his oath to "protect, preserve, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Moreover, there was no need so far as his own party is concerned, since its National Committee had already been directed by its representatives assembled in convention to require that "the selection of delegates and alternates be made through a primary election conducted by the party organization in each State where such expression and election are not provided for by State law."

Since, then, the legislation proposed was unnecessary, could not be effected in the face of certain opposition from the South and, upon its face, would be pronounced unconstitutional, the only possible conclusion is that the President either was willing to "find a way" to subvert the Constitution or that he advanced a revolutionary proposition solely for political effect. Happily, the outcome is limited by both law and fact to the quite negligible consequence of a purely academic suggestion.

(2) Foreign entanglements.

It is a cardinal principle of foreign Powers, and of Great Britain particularly, to protect the persons and properties of their citizens the world over. The patience which they have manifested, at our solicitation, at the devastation in Mexico is unprecedented, as an evidence of special consideration. But how long can it be maintained by any government, however friendly? How soon will it cease to be regarded as a virtue by a powerful Opposition? The Tory journals of England are becoming more critical daily, French newspapers are drawing sharp contrasts between the "ineffectual idealism" of our "watchful waiting" and the shocking brutalities which characterize the fighting in Mexico, and the spokesmen of Germany constantly and caustically inquire how we can justify the policy announced by the President at Mobile.

And how, in truth, can we? Because foreign investors have driven hard bargains in South America in the past, are we warranted in prohibiting the granting of concessions which presumably tend to development of resources in the future?

"What these states are going to see," declared the President, "is an emancipation from the subordination, which has been inevitable, to foreign enterprises. . . . I rejoice in nothing so much as in the prospect that they will now be emancipated from these conditions, and we ought to be the first to take part in assisting in that emancipation."

"It is a policy," added Secretary Bryan, "that has been substituted for Dollar Diplomacy. The foreign capitalist has too often been a disturbing factor in Latin America."

Now what can this mean? That literally we shall forbid South American governments to make further concessions to European capitalists? Or merely that we shall insist upon supervising the trades and fixing the terms? Countries like Peru and Ecuador and Bolivia cannot uncover their vast resources without the use of quantities of money which they themselves do not possess. If they are not to be allowed to obtain the requisite capital from England or France or Germany, upon the best terms they can make, where are they to get it? Surely not from the Treasury of the United States. Not even Secretary Bryan would propose that. From American investors, then, upon most modest terms fixed by the State Department? Hardly! Our people have never shown a disposition to embark in South American enterprises, even when offered the extraordinary inducements which attracted foreigners. Are they likely now to hazard their fortunes for profits not only prospective but restricted, in far-off lands, when billions of tested securities at home are awaiting absorption? Whence, then, is the "emancipation" by considerate lenders at easy rates to come?

Is it emancipation? Is it not enslavement? By what conceivable right or upon what fancied theory can the United States assume a suzerainty so complete and so far-reaching? That is the question which some South American or European government is bound to raise, and soon, too, with respect to a definite transaction. What will be the answer of the Administration? What can it be? Shall we, if pressed, recede from the Mobile Declaration? Or shall we fight, if

need be, in defense of a doctrine which is obviously untenable? In either case, how would Bolivia or Ecuador or Peru profit from such interposition in favor of "human rights, national integrity, and opportunity as against material interests"?

We cannot but conclude that President Wilson did not perceive the ending of this extraordinary proposition when he launched its beginning. And we can but hope that contingencies likely to result in embarrassment, if not humiliation, to both the country and himself may not arise.

(3) Business depression.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his first report made to Congress on December 3rd, recalls that "a feeling of unrest began to pervade business circles last April," and congratulates the country upon the immediate effect of his own alertness in announcing that \$500,000,000 of emergency currency provided by the Aldrich-Vreeland Act would be issued forthwith, if the banks should require it to "ease the situation." The relief, he declares, was "instantaneous"; that is, the banks did not need the emergency currency, did not ask for it, and so none was issued. In brief, there was no money stringency, such as he had shrewdly suspected, calling for his somewhat precipitate announcement.

But idle and available funds are ever the *bête noire* of a promoter, and the eager Secretary could not rest easy until he had scattered some of the cash at his disposal among the people. Having heard somewhere that money was required to move the crops, he invited, or rather requested, Western and Southern banks to accept the use of \$50,000,000 from the Treasury vaults. Considerations of partisanship were rigidly excluded from the generous proposal. "It was essential," said the Secretary in his report, "that the action of the Department should be non-partisan and non-political; the crops of Republicans, Democrats, Progressives, and all other classes of people had to be moved, and the earnest effort of the Department was to have the benefits of this action diffused as widely and impartially as possible." Who comprise "the other classes" can only be imagined. Socialists and Prohibitionists, we suppose. In any case, the Secretary firmly informs us that he frowned severely upon any suggestion that the money be tendered exclusively to original Wilson Democrats. Clearly, such a proceeding did

not comport with his conception of the duty of a Secretary of the Treasury—for which, of course, we are duly thankful; but, in all candor and sorrow, was ever such witless demagoguery?

Be that as it may have been, a sufficient number of bankers yielded to temptation to take thirty-five of the fifty millions urged upon them, used it as they saw fit; and the Secretary is now waiting for it to be “gradually repaid.” The fact, of course, is that there was no occasion to make these unusual deposits. There was no currency famine at crop-moving time and there is none now.

It is not lack of money that makes for the existing depression in business; it is lack of confidence. Nothing could be more fallacious than the notion which apparently possesses this Administration that expansion of credits is the sole requisite of commercial activities. The real essential is a market. Prudent manufacturers do not borrow money, even when they can obtain it upon easy terms, for the sake of paying interest, they seek it only when they can use it to advantage in providing goods that can be sold promptly and profitably. All such felt that revival of demand might ensue almost immediately from final enactment of the new Tariff Bill and acted accordingly, greatly to the satisfaction of those who had insisted that no untoward consequences would flow from a mere change of rates. But the happy moment arrived and nothing happened. Merchants not only continued to doubt the wisdom of filling their shelves, but as sales gradually diminished they began to cancel orders increasingly, to the end that, in the latter part of November, there came about what Mr. Samuel Untermyer depicted in his speech to the Economic Club of Springfield as “a sudden and alarming cessation of business activities all over the country,” hardly, if ever, preceded in the history of our industries.

The consequence is that business in all lines is, to-day, at a standstill. And the worst of it is that it is no mere depression; it is positive dejection. The very spirit of enterprise seems to have evaporated for the time. Nobody is even trying to do things. The common disposition is to retrench in every direction, to take no chances while holding fast to such certainties as may exist and generally to adopt a policy of what the President would designate as “watchful waiting.”

The President himself is convinced that prompt passage of the Currency Bill would start the wheels of industry a-whirling. We doubt it for many reasons, not the least of which is that the sole basis upon which he rests his sanguine anticipation is that it is only necessary "to set credit free from arbitrary and artificial restraints." That is a desirable thing to do, no doubt, and certain ultimately to prove advantageous. But radical revolution of a delicate and complex financial system cannot be encompassed so completely as to produce marked benefits in a month or perhaps in a year. Assuming the passage of the most nearly perfect measure that could be devised by the wit of man, time must be had for adjustment of the many parts of the intricate machinery. Moreover, if, as we have assumed and believe, the present unhappy state of affairs is attributable far less to lack of credits than to lack of confidence, practically no immediate relief can be anticipated from the source to which the President pins his faith.

So far from attempting to affix the blame for the plight in which the country finds itself, we frankly cannot perceive even now how it could have been averted. But none can deny that the condition exists nor that the cloud which represents it is much larger than a man's hand and shows no signs of diminishing.

(4) Class legislation.

Commenting upon the passage, as an Administration measure, of the "rider" to the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill forbidding the use of money therein appropriated for prosecuting labor unions and farmers' associations for violating the law, we said in this REVIEW for November:

In brief, the proviso was regarded by its sponsors as a mere precursor of a definite amendment of the "substantive statutes" to exempt one class from the punishment visited upon all other classes for criminal offenses against the law. Already signs appear that, encouraged by President Wilson's attitude, Mr. Gompers intends to urge this explicit proposal upon Congress at the coming regular session, in conformity with the prediction of Senator Hughes. The inevitableness of this consequence of the President's action was apparent from the beginning. It becomes evident, therefore, that unless the President can and will control and chain the forces opposed to the fundamental principle of "equal rights for all" which he himself has unloosed, the country will very soon face a determined struggle for class domination whose outcome every patriotic citizen must contemplate with the gravest foreboding.

This prediction was fulfilled promptly upon the first day of the regular session, when identical bills were introduced in the Senate by Mr. Bacon and in the House by Representative Bartlett, who championed the "rider" to the Urgent Deficiency Bill, re-establishing the spoils system in the Internal Revenue department. The proposal is entitled: "A bill to make lawful certain agreements between employees and laborers engaged in agriculture or horticulture, and to limit the issuing of injunctions in certain cases, and for other purposes." It provides:

First. That it shall not be unlawful for persons employed or seeking employment to enter into any arrangements, agreements, or combinations with the view of lessening the hours of labor, or of increasing their wages, or of bettering their condition; nor shall any arrangements, agreements, or combinations be unlawful among persons engaged in horticulture or agriculture when made with the view of enhancing the price of agricultural or horticultural products.

Second. No Federal Judge or court may issue any injunction in any labor dispute or with respect to any agreement or combination to fix the prices of agricultural products unless to prevent irreparable injury to property or a property right of the person making the application for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

Third. That this prohibition is modified by providing that for the purpose of the act certain fundamental rights of property shall not be considered such under certain circumstances, that is, the right to employ or be employed, or to change these relations and assume new relations of employer and employee, or to carry on business with any person in any place, or to earn one's living as an employee, shall be personal and not property rights; and

Fourth. That persons at work or seeking work shall neither be indicted, prosecuted, or tried in any Federal court for entering into any kind of an agreement or combination to better their working conditions or for enhancing the price of agricultural products unless any act which they do in pursuance of their combinations or agreements would be in itself unlawful.

Whatever doubts may have arisen in President Wilson's mind respecting the "intent" of the Congress in enacting the Sundry Civil proviso, which he himself put forward, there can be no possible question of the purpose of this measure. It is direct and explicit. It not only removes every form of conspiracy and combination of labor unions and farmers' associations from the Sherman Act, but it guarantees immunity to both from either civil or criminal liability under every Federal law upon the statute-books. President Taft pronounced its insinuating precursor which President Wilson signed "class legislation of the most

vicious sort." Writing of the Pearre Bill, which embodied the same provisions and was rejected in 1908, President Roosevelt declared unhesitatingly in his Message to the Sixtieth Congress that it "represented a course of policy which, if carried out, would mean the enthronement of class privilege in its crudest and most brutal form and the destruction of one of the most essential forms of the judicial protection in all civilized lands."

The proposal is so plainly abhorrent to the American principle of equality before the law that explication seems unnecessary. Suffice it to say, for the present, at least, that the Bill introduced by Senator Bacon and Representative Bartlett was, in fact, formulated by the American Federation of Labor under the direction of Mr. Gompers, precisely as we foretold.

Simultaneously, Representative Robert L. Henry, Chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules, added to the amendments to the Sherman Act, which he introduced on December 1st, the following:

Section 10. That nothing in said Act is intended nor shall any provision thereof hereafter be enforced, so as to apply to members of organizations or associations not for profit and without capital, or to agricultural products, or live stock, in the hands of the producer or raisers.

Here again is complete exemption to be accorded without reserve or qualification by "substantive law." Representative Henry justified his action in the following statement to the Press:

Section 10 provides that the Act shall not apply to members of organizations not for profit and without capital stock, or to agricultural products or live stock in the hands of the producer or raiser. The exception is deemed proper for the simple reason that, under an appropriation bill recently passed and *signed by the President*, Congress provided that no part of a fund appropriated and placed at the disposal of the Attorney-General should be used in the prosecution of those belonging to labor organizations, etc. This shows the national will and intent as expressed by Congress.

Mr. Henry's deduction is entirely logical. If it was proper to withhold funds for prosecution of a class from one appropriation bill, it is equally right to withhold them from all. Mr. Henry's bestowal of responsibility for such proposals upon the President also is fully warranted. He might indeed have gone further and said with absolute truth "instigated" as well as "signed" by the President.

The Henry Bill is not the Administration measure. That is yet to be formulated to conform to the promised Message. But nothing could be plainer than that the time is distressingly close at hand when President Wilson must choose between disappointing the powerful class whose hopes of special favor he himself has raised and fulfilling his own solemn pledge to the American people to oppose with all his strength "every form of special privilege and exemptions" while holding himself as President dedicated to "the common as against any particular interest whatever."

Is not here a cloud upon President Wilson's sky which cannot be descried, say, upon Mr. Taft's or, perhaps more significantly, upon Mr. Roosevelt's?

(5) Defeat of the Administration.

It is an Administration Congress. President Wilson assumed command, as leader of his party, immediately upon his election, and he has maintained his authority by sheer driving force, supplemented by discriminating use of patronage. No signs appear that his hold will be weakened or that his predominancy will be seriously questioned during the present session. Inevitably, therefore, and more specifically, perhaps, than ever before the country will render a verdict upon the Administration at the Congressional elections in November of the coming year. If the Democrats carry the House of Representatives, the President will have won a notable victory; if they fail to hold a majority, he will have suffered an irreparable defeat. There is no question in our mind as to how the people would vote to-day. They would sustain the Administration, not merely through a division of the opposition, but gladly and avowedly as a tribute to Mr. Wilson's earnestness and devotion to duty, and to give him full opportunity to develop his policies. The vital result in November will be determined wholly by what shall be done affirmatively and what shall happen incidentally in the mean time.

What are the prospects in the light of past experiences and present conditions? The House now comprises 291 Democrats and 144 Republicans (including the few Progressives and as of the beginning of Congress). The Democratic majority—147—is so great that a reversal in two short years seems to be practically inconceivable. But let us see. In 1886 the Democrats retained the control they had won in

1884, along with the election of Mr. Cleveland, but their majority shrank from 84 to a scant 15. In 1892 they swept the country, only, as a consequence of tariff legislation and hard times, to reap disaster two years later. The comparison is striking:

	Democrats.	Republicans.
House elected in 1892.....	220	126
House elected in 1894.....	104	246

During those two years the Democrats lost 116 members out of 220. If, this year, they should lose 74 members out of 291, they would forfeit control of the House of Representatives and of all legislation.

The fact, too, must not be overlooked that the majority in 1892 was a real majority won against a united opposition, whereas the present majority is only apparent. Just as Mr. Wilson is a plurality President, so is the Democratic House a plurality House. If Republicans and Progressives had voted together in 1912, they would have had a majority of 12 in the present House.

Take New York as an example. Its delegation stands: Democrats, 32; Republicans, 11. A fusion of Republicans and Progressives would have resulted: Democrats, 16; Opposition, 27. New Jersey is represented by 11 Democrats and 1 Republican. Fusion of Republicans and Progressives would have elected 5 Democrats and 8 Opposition.

True, a complete union of Republicans and Progressives at the forthcoming elections is beyond power of accomplishment, even though an understanding should be reached by the leaders. With only Republicans and Democrats in the race, a certain proportion of the Progressive vote would go to the Wilson candidates. Whether this percentage would suffice to offset the effect of Democratic disaffection in States like New York and Illinois is a question. Whether it would overcome the far greater and incalculable consequence of continuing and increasing business depression, lack of employment for hundreds of thousands of workingmen and disgust at income taxation, added to the normal reaction which invariably follows a Presidential victory, is even more problematical. Enough has been said, in any case, to show that little dependence can be put upon faith in maintaining a majority simply because it is large; the record of 1894 indicates how quickly it may disappear entirely. Nor, in our humble judgment, should too much

reliance be placed upon a continuance of Mr. Roosevelt's obduracy. None realizes better than that most astute of politicians that, to win the Presidency in 1916, he must (1) defeat Mr. Wilson in the Congressional elections and incapacitate him for the remainder of his term, (2) avert further disclosure of the numerical weakness of his own party, and (3) reconcile Republicans and business men generally to his candidacy. For ourselves, we shall be greatly surprised if the movement looking to a union of forces already inaugurated by Mr. Roosevelt's personal lieutenant, Comptroller Prendergast of New York City, does not eventuate in sharply drawn lines between the Democratic party and the Opposition in the coming November elections.

This is but political speculation, to be sure; it could hardly be magnified, therefore, into a cloud upon the horizon of a properly sanguine President; but, as what they upon the golf-links call a fine Scotch mist, we confidently reckon its claim to be worthy of passing consideration.

We shall not dwell upon other causes of disquietude which readily occur to mind. We wish that we could share the President's apparent optimism, and would be the last to increase his difficulties by direful prophecies. But it is necessary to recognize conditions if we would overcome them, and it is idle to deny that the situation at the beginning of this fateful year is one calling for the exercise of supreme wisdom, rare courage, and patient tolerance. The truth is that the duties and responsibilities of a President of the United States have grown to be almost greater than one man should be called upon to bear. And Mr. Wilson, by temperament, by inclination, and by circumstance, stands singularly alone. Of his chief official aides and advisers, barring Mr. Bryan, who has constituted himself a sort of President Emeritus, but two—the Attorney-General and the Secretary of War—have so far impressed upon the country a sense of their full fitness for the headship of great Departments.

That the President himself has erred grievously in some respects we have felt impelled to indicate as clearly as might be, to obviate, if possible, unfortunate repetitions, but much, very much, is atoned for by his extraordinary faithfulness to duty. We doubt if among all of Mr. Wilson's predecessors can be named a President who gave himself so completely, so unsparingly, to his work. He need

have no apprehension whatever that the country fails to recognize and appreciate to the utmost his really splendid application to the public service, but the fact that self-sacrifice such as this merits exceptional consideration cannot be too frequently or too strongly emphasized.

We cannot but believe that defeat of the Administration in November would be a National calamity. We sincerely hope, therefore, that the clouds which we seem to perceive may disappear like mists from the face of the sea; that peace may be unbroken, that prosperity may be restored, and that the spirit of contentment may again possess the souls of men in this most blessed of lands in a Happy New Year.

ENTERING SECTION NO. 1914

THE signal is set and the train stops abruptly at the beginning of Section 1914. Five minutes for scrutiny of self and examination of trunks full of deeds! Can we pass the Customs unscathed? Shall we read approval in the eyes of the Great Commissioner of Humanity?

Years ago a wise man dreamed a dream. He, too, was a passenger on the main line of life and awoke with a start when the halt came. The travelers who alighted were of all sorts and conditions. There were ministers of state and titled personages, archbishops and bishops, opulent men and sumptuously attired ladies, from the Pullmans; an English duke and his duchess and an American millionaire and his vivacious second wife from their private cars. There were salesmen and farmers, scholars and editors, artists and writers, secretaries and typists, workingmen and tired women, beggars and thieves, from the coaches.

All were eager to hasten onward to their destinations and all were provoked by the delay. The ministers grumbled, the millionaires swore, the vulgar women scolded, even the high-born ladies betrayed impatience. Only the laborers and school-boys joked and laughed while they jostled their neighbors, while those of broken spirits, the poverty-stricken, the sick and needy, the worn and weary, were dully indifferent. But one of all the number seemed buoyed by hope and expectancy. She was a distinguished-looking lady in deep mourning. Her husband, it appeared, had been

stopped at the same station not long before and she thought it possible that she might see him again. The station-master looked at her more gently than at the others. She had said nothing, but he knew what was in her mind, and the irony passed out of his face. To those who complained most loudly of their detention and demanded to know why they were not sent forward he said curtly, "You will see."

Presently a bell rang and the door of the customs-house was flung open. The impatient travelers crowded inside and began an eager search for their belongings. In vain. The station-master announced dryly that the luggage would be forwarded by the next train. The late owners would have no further use for it, and it would be delivered to their friends. What could this mean? Before a single passenger could voice his amazement and indignation, each beheld upon the long table a plain box labeled with his name. The lids flew off, and, within, instead of clothes and hats and jewelry, were samples of work done by each for the general good—how much he had done for society and how much he had received in return. None, it appeared, could proceed if the balance were against him.

Immediately a well-dressed gentleman, supported by others of like appearance, protested. He had been amply provided for from birth, he had lived as became a gentleman, he had never robbed or cheated, he had paid handsomely for what he consumed, he had given generously, he had kept the Commandments according to the interpretation put upon them by his class, he had never been told that he must work, as one compelled to earn a living; why should he? The whole proceeding was an indefensible outrage. He would appeal to a higher court.

"Ladies and gentlemen," sighed the official, "there can be no appeal from a law of nature. There are but three ways of living: by working, by stealing, or by begging. Those who have not lived by the first have lived by one of the other two, for not a meal can be had that some one has not worked to produce."

So a large majority of the Pullman passengers and even the duke and his duchess were told to stand aside, and the thieves and vagabonds came forward. Their plea was simple enough. They had not sought existence, but, having been brought into the world against their wish, the world owed them a living and they must get it as best they could.

“ We have heard that before,” was all the official deigned to reply.

Then up spoke an earnest-looking man whose work had borne inspection better than that of most of the others. So far as he was concerned, the examiners might spare their labor. He had no excuses to offer. From his earliest years he had known what he ought to do, and in no instance had completely done it. He had conquered some faults, but his power of acting had never been able to keep up with his constantly growing knowledge. The sense of his shortcomings became stronger daily. Indeed, he had come to realize that the very best he could do would be unworthy of acceptance—and none knew better than he that he seldom did even that. He had been told that, if he abandoned claim on the score of his own merit, he might be received for the sake of what another had done. He hoped this was true. It was his only chance.

The chief examiner listened attentively; then, looking kindly at him, replied:

“ We do not expect impossibilities, and we do not blame you for not having accomplished what was beyond your strength. Human beings are born ignorant and helpless. At first they cannot do rightly at all. They improve under teaching and practice. They learn to walk by falling down. They learn to live aright by going wrong. We do not record his early sins against a man if he has been honestly trying to improve himself, whether he fully succeeds or not. No one has power to fulfil the law completely. Therefore, it is no crime in him if he fails. We reckon as faults only those which spring from idleness, wilfulness, selfishness, and deliberate preference of evil to good. Each is judged according to what he has received.”

Thereupon the decrees were entered and all went their various ways. The duchess was sent to begin her life again in a laborer's cottage, finally to become a housemaid. The fine gentleman was made a plowboy. The preachers were to become mechanics; the artists, blacksmiths; and so on down the line to the thieves and cheats who had attributed their sinning to poverty. They were to awake in palaces surrounded with luxury.

“ They will all be here again in a few years,” the station-master said, “ and it will be the same story over again. They have been tried in all positions, and there is still

nothing to show, nothing but complaints of circumstances. Some of the worst, I have known made at last into pigs and geese, to be fattened up and eaten, and made of use in that way. Others have become asses, condemned to carry heavy burdens, to be beaten with sticks, and to breed asses like themselves for a hundred generations. All finally take the shape that suits their character. For my part, I would put most of them out altogether; but that is not for me to say."

So ended the dream of the great nobleman or of the archbishop, or of both, as recounted at much greater length by Mr. Froude.

It is a striking allegory and characteristic of the dour man who conceived it. But Mr. Froude lived and died solely in his quite wonderful mind, and even that was analytical rather than philosophical, despite his own belief to the contrary. Whether he was born incapacitated for affection, or so abundantly endowed with the power of reasoning that his natural instincts became blunted in later life, is wholly conjectural. It seems strange that his nature should have been so little influenced by his own matchless transcript of the powerful argument of Origen in reply to Celsus, which stands to this day as the deductive basis of the Christian religion. For Froude was no scoffer. How sympathetically, almost tenderly, he speaks of the discouraged man who found his last hope in the assurance that, regardless of his own shortcomings, he might be received for the sake of what another had done! And then his sigh of relief at the station-master's final declaration that, however just might be the sentences which he would impose upon faultful humans, it was not, after all, for him to say! Here appear most vividly signs of innate simplicity and sincerity of spirit.

What Froude lacked apparently was faith. He should have accompanied Saul on that most famous and inspiring of journeys from Jerusalem to Damascus and learned to ask, with the great Apostle, in deep humility, yet unafraid, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" That is what is happening really, increasingly, and notably throughout our own country to-day. More and more, men and women are realizing that they can do little for themselves except as they do for others. It is a new kind of personal service that is coming to possess the minds and hearts of our people—a kind that finds its impulse less in a sense of arduous

duty and more in a spirit of keen desire. In the face of so glowing a fact as this, the fretfulness and envies and mutual distrusts which we cannot but perceive and lament become as the merest trifles dotting the way of constantly advancing civilization. No; as a nation and a people we can pass the Customs at the end of Section 1913, if not unscathed, at least without severe reproach.

The track is clear. Send on the train!

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not broken itself up into fragments by narrow
domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of Truth;
Where tireless striving reaches its arms toward perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary
desert sand of dry habit;
Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought
and action;
Into that haven of Freedom, O Lord, let my country awake!"

AFTER HUERTA, WHO?

WE quote from the *Utica Observer*:

It is necessary in preparing articles for a monthly publication to do so some weeks in advance of their issue, and one who reads the current number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW will be astonished in the perusal of this article of Colonel Harvey's, as it is written from the standpoint of some weeks ago; and as luck would have it, Colonel Harvey's predictions and estimates have failed to materialize. His forecast as to the sequence of events fails in every particular, and his positive assertion as to the fate of President Wilson's Mexican policy falls flat. . . .

All of which shows how very short-sighted a man will be, even though he may be a student of the affairs of the time and the directing mind of a publication of such pretensions as THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. . . .

It may be believed that Colonel Harvey will in the future pay more attention to the cultivation of foresight and not be quite so ready to attack those measures upon which Woodrow Wilson has given his deepest thought and most careful study.

Our contemporary errs entirely with respect to the facts. The only "forecast" we made was implied in the assertion that the inevitable effect of President Wilson's original insistence was to rivet Huerta in his place, "there to remain, in all probability, until removed by force of arms." If there

now exists any ground for reversal of that judgment, it is not discernible.

We said the President's policy had failed. What was that policy? It was set forth clearly in the conditions prescribed by Mr. Wilson and made known to Huerta by Mr. John Lind, to wit: (a) to cease fighting, (b) to give security for an early and free election, (c) Huerta to bind himself not to be a candidate, and (d) all parties to agree to abide by the result. This virtual ultimatum was delivered in August. It is now December and fighting is more general than ever, there has been no election of an executive, Huerta is still President, and no one of the parties will agree to abide by any result except the establishment of its own complete supremacy. If that is not failure of a plan, what is it?

No doubt the President gave the subject his best thought and study, as he should have done, but the outcome remains the same. The fact is, as we pointed out and as Dr. Theodore S. Woolsey, Professor Emeritus of International Law in Yale University, states more bluntly, the Administration "started wrong" and has felt obliged to persist in its course. "So far as the American public has been informed," Dr. Woolsey continues, "this is the sum and substance of Wilson's policy—never to recognize Huerta nor his Congress—and for the reason that Huerta is so bad a man. Meanwhile, the Administration, upheld by its good intentions, optimistic that Huerta, under the weight of disapproval, will climb down from his high horse, is exposing itself to the derision of an uncharitable world. . . . Our policy should be to strengthen somebody in Mexico, not to weaken everybody; to build up, not to pull down. In refusing *ever* to recognize Huerta, the Administration has violated our usage and the dictates of common sense. Is it honest enough and strong enough to correct its blunder? There is an obstinacy of strength; there is also an obstinacy of weakness."

These are vigorous words from our highest authority; too vigorous, it seems to us, in one particular. It is quite true that "an uncharitable world" has questioned somewhat sharply the wisdom and practicability of Mr. Wilson's departure from precedent in international usage, but nobody to our knowledge has "derided" it. On the contrary, his purpose and effort have been commended abroad generally

and in England notably. In our own country, too, the universal disposition has been and still is to hope for a satisfactory outcome. Mr. Taft voiced this common sentiment admirably and manfully in a public speech, despite his reference, which seemed to us hardly called for, to the President's policy as "whatever it may be." The warrant for the observation may have been sufficiently apparent, but it was somewhat of a pity to mar a generous declaration with what many could but regard as a covert, though gentle, sneer.

Moreover, the policy itself is plain enough. It is, as the President frankly said in his Message, one of "watchful waiting" until something shall happen. "And then, when the end comes"—*i. e.*, when Huerta shall be deposed—"we shall hope to see constitutional order restored in distressed Mexico by the concert and energy of such of her leaders as prefer the liberty of their people to their own ambitions." In other words, the Administration believes that it is only a question of time when the rebels, or self-called Constitutionalists, will succeed by force where moral suasion failed and will put out the dictator. It will then meet the situation as it shall then exist. Meanwhile, there is nothing that it can do or ought to do beyond what it is doing in safeguarding, so far as possible, the lives and properties of Americans and foreigners.

However unfortunate this Micawber-like programme may be, we are committed to it, and that is the end of the matter. Here caviling, in such a situation, is wholly idle and might easily come to be regarded with justice as unpatriotic.

This fetches us to the question now on everybody's lips! After Huerta, What? Or should we say, Whom? Because such a thing as free government by the expressed will and consent of the people in Mexico to-day is simply inconceivable. Nobody understands this better than Mr. Wilson himself. Nobody has expressed the fact more truly or more exactly than he did when he wrote some years ago:

Self-government is not a thing that can be "given" to any people, because it is a form of character and not a form of constitution. No people can be "given" the self-control of maturity. Only a long apprenticeship of obedience can secure them the precious possession.

That is what the Mexican people must have—"a long apprenticeship of obedience" to law and order. And some one, backed up by the United States, must enforce that

obedience for a period of years. The President thinks that unselfish leaders may spring up out of the ground—men who “prefer the liberty of their people to their own ambitions.” Maybe so, but we doubt it. The three men in sight now are Villa and Zapata, two of the most bloodthirsty bandits the world has ever known, and Carranza—the amiable Carranza. What of him? The correspondent of the London *Times* found him an agreeable person, of studious countenance, gentle voice, and impaired physical vitality. “It must be by force of character and intellect,” the writer noted, “that he has reached his present dangerously high position.” He continues:

“I am the only leader recognized as supreme by all the chiefs of the revolution,” Carranza told me in his quiet, measured speech, not with pride, but as one upon whom a heavy responsibility lay. “What we fight for is the Constitution of our country and the development of our people. Huerta outraged the Constitution when he overthrew and murdered President Madero. He continues to outrage it by attempting to govern despotically as Diaz did, and refusing to administer fairly the laws, which are equal for all. This revolution cannot cease until either we, the Constitutionalists, triumph, or until Huerta triumphs completely over us. Even in the latter case it would only cease for the moment. It has its roots in social causes. The land, which was formerly divided among the mass of the people, has been seized by a few. The owners of it compel those who are working for them to buy the necessities of life from them alone. They lay a burden of debt upon the poor people and make them virtually slaves, for as long as the people owe them money they cannot go away. If they try to go away, they can be brought back. They can be put in prison. Another cause of the revolution is the growth of a middle class. Formerly there were only the rich and the poor. Now there is a class in between which does not like to see the poor oppressed: which knows what democracy and social reforms mean in other countries, and which is resolved to take successive steps forward in the direction of complete self-government.”

“Have you any definite plans for land reform and other reforms?” I inquired.

He thought a moment. Then he replied: “The first necessity is the fair and free election of a President. The election which is proposed now will be a farce. In the disturbed state of our country it is impossible to hold a proper election. Large numbers of voters will not know anything about it. We Constitutionalists refuse to recognize any President who may be returned at the fraudulent election. We shall execute anybody who does recognize him.”

“I beg your pardon,” I said. “Would you kindly repeat your last statement?” I thought I must have misunderstood it.

“We shall,” the General said, calmly, and as if he were making a perfectly natural remark, “execute any one who recognizes a President unconstitutionally elected and directly or indirectly guilty of participation in the murder of Madero.”

To hear this amiable, scholarly old gentleman define so bloodthirsty and to us so utterly unreasonable a line of action made me feel as if I were dreaming. It threw a strange light upon his profession of belief in democracy. I have no doubt that he sincerely imagines himself a believer in that creed. I am sure that the best of his followers are equally sincere, though of course there are many who fight simply because they prefer disorder and make a profit out of looting. The very fact that the party calls itself the "Constitutionalistas" and not the "Carranzistas" proves that it follows a principle rather than a man. But the discrepancy between their professions and their avowed policy shows how far the mentality of Mexico is distant from that of Europe and the United States, and how impossible it is to apply to it, as President Wilson persists in doing, the same tests and the same standards which obtain in countries where the idea of self-government is a plant of mature growth.

It is the custom of the Constitutionalists and Federals alike to execute all the general and field officers who are captured; sometimes other officers, and even men. They justify this by reference to a law of 1862 against fomenting treason. Each side calls the other side "traitors," and the only course to take with a "traitor"—that is, a man who differs from your views—is to shoot him. Several Mexicans have quite seriously told me that Madero failed simply because he tried to make terms with supporters of the old régime of Diaz and his *científicos* (so his ministers were derisively called) instead of killing them. They are mistaken. Madero failed chiefly because he was a bundle of nerves and what Americans call a "crank," and because he promised what he could not possibly perform. He made the poor *peons* think they would immediately be given the equivalent of the English peasant's "three acres and a cow," and they turned against him when they awakened from the dream. But the blame cast upon him for not "removing his enemies" is a sign-post toward understanding the Mexican mind.

Subsequently, writing with like naïveté to the Governor of Arizona in defense of Villa's murdering of prisoners, the benign Carranza said:

With strict deference to the law provided the Huertista officers were tried and executed in the city of Juarez. Among them were some who had been captured at Torreon by this same General Villa, who, after pardoning them, agreed that they should be enlisted by our forces. Thereafter they endeavored, but unsuccessfully, to create a defection of the men whom I intrusted to their command, finally deserting to re-engage in crime.

"It is true," the kindly old gentleman continued, "that the established principles observed in international wars extend to prisoners the privilege of pardon or immunity from bodily harm, but in civil struggles the most civilized nations in all ages have employed more rigorous and bloody means even than we have been compelled to adopt. And with reference to the executions of the officers in the city of

Juarez, there should be perceived not any needless cruelty visited upon prisoners of war, but merely such punishment as was prescribed by the law applicable to offenders against the public peace and safety."

He concluded with the simple statement that he found it necessary to be "somewhat strict in the enforcement of the law of Juarez"; that is, in killing prisoners taken in battle and in "executing any one who recognizes a President unconstitutionally elected." Further revelation of the character of the amiable Carranza is hardly necessary.

High-minded, noble, and humane leaders such as President Wilson has in his mind's eye there may be in Mexico; but if so they have not yet put themselves in evidence.

There seems to be nothing for it, then, but to wait and watch and drift until foreign governments demand action or until somebody performs a miracle.

THE RAILWAYS AND THE PEOPLE

UNDOUBTEDLY the most vital practical problem now pressing for resolution is that involved in the proposed increase of freight railway rates throughout the country. It is not merely "The Plight of the Railways" that Mr. Lauck sets forth so comprehensively and so admirably elsewhere in this REVIEW; it is the plight of the country and, in a sense, of the Administration. Technically, to be sure, the matter is to be determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but since a majority of the members of that Commission are about to be appointed by the President, and since, rightly or wrongly, he will be held largely responsible for the decision, the closeness of the relationship is manifest.

One has but to read Mr. Lauck's article to appreciate the many phases and perplexities which must be taken into consideration. There can be no doubt that the railway companies are seriously embarrassed by lack of funds actually needed for betterments and additional equipment, and, at a glance, it seems only fair that they should be recompensed in part, at least, through increased charges, for the enhanced costs of labor, materials, and taxation which they are compelled to bear. But whether they should be permitted to draw upon the public for additional funds

with which to maintain dividends is another question, to which no general answer can be given with surety of its justice. Much of the railway stock outstanding was issued for nothing, in the form of bonuses or construction profits, but the percentages thus disbursed by the various companies differ tremendously. Moreover, comparatively few of such shares now remain in the possession of the original beneficiaries. Substantially all have been taken over by investors and gradually diffused in lots so small that the common saying that "the people own the railroads" has much basis in fact. The point, too, cannot be overlooked that the promoters and bankers who first obtained "watered" stocks acted within their legal rights and conformably to customs fully known and commonly recognized as legitimate at the time. The futility of attempting to enforce a general, wide-spread "restitution," therefore, becomes apparent.

But that fact constitutes no reason for permitting continuance of the undesirable process. It was well enough and right enough, from a common-sense viewpoint, for President Elliott of the New Haven Company to say "let bygones be bygones," but it was equally essential, from the public and governmental position, for Commissioner Prouty to insist upon being convinced that they are bygones. There is little, if any, suspicion that railway directors at the moment, or for some time to come, would divert additional revenues from actual needs into speculative channels, but Mr. Prouty demands assurance that the old methods shall *never* be resumed. "When," he said, "it is no longer possible for railroads to spend money except for railroad purposes, when railroads cannot buy securities of other railroads, and when railroads cannot issue any securities except with Federal supervision, then, and not until then, can you safely permit any increases in rates."

In other words, Commissioner Prouty demands legislation providing for governmental supervision of expenditures as a condition precedent to increasing of rates. The questions immediately arise! Is such legislation desirable? and, How soon can it be obtained? To the first, in our judgment, the answer should be affirmative. There is no reason why the Commission should not, and every reason at the present time why it should, exercise such supervisory authority. The people support the railroads, the people own the rail-

roads, and the people have a perfect right to appoint their own government to watch over and safeguard their interests. As a purely practical matter, moreover, it is certain that the exercise of such supervision would not only enhance materially the market values of securities thus approved and issued, but would tend generally to allay the distrust which now prevents borrowing for positive necessities.

Whether the legislation required by Commissioner Prouty can be obtained in time to save the railways from serious distress is a political question which nobody seems able to answer. It is but natural, however, to assume that the President and the Democratic leaders of Congress are fully advised upon this point and will soon act in such a way as to indicate their conclusion. It may be that, pending the formulation of measures whose preparation obviously demands the greatest of care, the Commission could achieve its immediate purpose by exacting guarantees in some effective form from the companies. As to that, also, there appears no convincing expression of opinion.

The one certainty is that the situation is poignant and laden with possibilities of advantage and disadvantage to all concerned. It is clear that raising of railway rates cannot be expected to diminish the cost of living, and it seems to be equally plain that succor of the railroads is the first requisite of a start toward more prosperous conditions. So far as we can perceive, no question of essential principle is involved. It is a weighing or balancing of considerations which calls for the exercise of the best judgment that can be derived from common sense—and in resolving a problem of that nature full confidence, in our belief, can be felt in the determination finally reached by President Wilson.

PREACHER AND PRESIDENT

WAS Mr. Wilson elected President of the Presbyterians or President of the United States? The question was raised by the Rev. Dr. John R. Mackay, pastor of the North Presbyterian Church of New York City in his Thanksgiving sermon. After voicing gratitude for the ending of the Balkan War and the defeat of Tammany, the minister continued:

I had hoped to express as another cause for Thanksgiving that our President was at this hour worshiping like us in his own place of worship, but the morning newspapers inform us that he has decided to attend high mass and give as his explanation that President Roosevelt and President Taft having done so, the precedent has been established and he would not like to break it.

This explanation does not explain. The observance of precedent has formed no part in President Wilson's career. No man more than he has broken through every kind of precedent both in the White House and in Congress. To know there was a precedent for anything seems to him an invitation to break it, and now he pleads its sacredness. This is the President, and not the man, that speaks.

It suits him to go and he goes, and at such a time as this I personally feel that this is an outrage when done by a Protestant Christian; and further, we have just listened to the reading of the President's own proclamation in which he asks us to assemble in our own places of worship. Why should he exempt himself? He has a church of his own; a pew of his own; a place where he could worship according to his instincts and the belief of his own heart.

Why, then, should not he worship there? It pains me to speak thus about our President, but he has gone out of his way and carried himself in a way inconsistent with the general trend of his life to needlessly cause grief to many who hitherto have felt pride in his steadfast loyalty to convictions and his determination to be President of all the people.

It seems not to have occurred to Dr. Mackay that the breaking of the precedent established by Mr. Roosevelt of the Dutch Reformed Church and confirmed by Mr. Taft, Unitarian, might naturally and properly have been resented by the great body of Roman Catholics who, too, are citizens. And what trifling with truth to assert that Mr. Wilson "has broken through every kind of precedent in the White House and in Congress"! In delivering his Messages personally he did not discard a custom; he restored one; and in abandoning the senseless New Year's reception he merely recognized the obligation of a President to conserve his physical strength for performance of his real duties. What other precedent of the slightest importance has he failed to heed?

"This is the President, and not the man," said Dr. Mackay. Precisely. And when Mr. Wilson attended a Roman Catholic Church, though probably for but once in the year, he did the very thing that Dr. Mackay accuses him of not doing; he showed plainly his "determination to be President of the whole people"; and thereby he indicated incidentally that a Presbyterian is not necessarily a bigot—a fact whose firmer impressment upon the minds of

certain ministers of what they mistake for the Gospel would tend materially to enhance the power and encourage the growth of Christianity.

ON RESTRICTED RELIGION

THE third collect in the devotional service for Good Friday of the Protestant Episcopal Church reads as follows:

Oh, merciful God, Who hath made all men and hatest nothing that Thou hast made, nor desirest the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live, have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics, and take from them all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of Thy Word, and so fetch them home, Blessed Lord, to Thy flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelite, and be made one fold and one shepherd, Jesus Christ, our Lord, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

Two amendments presented to the House of Deputies are still pending. The first is a proposal by Dean William Grosvenor that the words "Have mercy upon all who know Thee not, as revealed in the Gospel of Thy Son" be substituted for the words "Jews, Turks, infidels, and heretics"; and that the words "saved among the remnant of the true Israelite, and be" be stricken out. The second, suggested by a deputy whose name is not given, is that the words "Have mercy upon Thine ancient people of Israel and all who have erred in darkness" be substituted therefor. The purpose of these proposed changes, of course, is to stop classing Jews with Turks, infidels, and heretics, because the doing of this is presumed to hurt their feelings. We doubt the correctness of the assumption. The Jews whom we know are satisfied with their religion and seem to be willing to take their chances of reaching heaven by their own road. We have never heard that they object to outsiders beseeching mercy for them specifically, but it is doubtful if they attach much value to such petitioning. Moreover, if given a choice, we consider it quite probable that they would as lief be named outright in a straightforward manner as be included with others who are supposed to "err in darkness." And why discriminate against the Turks? They, too, have a religion which has stood the test of time, and feelings to be hurt. Is it not, after all, logical and proper to pray either for our-

selves of the elect exclusively or for all creation without making distinctions of any kind, invidious or otherwise? There may be something more offensive in the eyes of the Lord than a patronizing religious aristocracy, but if so we have misread the Scriptures.

FOR PRESIDENT: W. J. B.

THE Hon. Lawrence Irving Handy is an ex-Congressman, a Son of Delaware, a resident of Philadelphia, and a novelty—*i. e.*, an original Bryan man. He was toastmaster for the Sons in the Quaker City the other evening, when the Honorable, the Secretary of State, was present. "Gentlemen," said Mr. Handy, speaking with curious exactitude to a group of Philadelphians—"gentlemen, I first introduced Mr. Bryan to Delaware seventeen years ago." What he meant to say was that he introduced Delaware to Our Hero some time back. However: "He is the greatest living orator speaking any language," not excepting Rabindranath Tagore, the Nobel prize-winner. "He is the personification of a wise and fearless Democracy." Excellent! "Embodiment" might possibly be preferred to "personification," but we do admire "wise and fearless"; they are strong and simple adjectives which can be easily understood; like, for example, "dishonest," as it was applied recently by Speaker Clark to officeholders who neglect their duties to lecture for hire. But back to the original Bryan man: "He has done great things, but I doubt not that he has before him greater things to do and to be." To do, perhaps; but hardly to be. Nevertheless, sez he, meaning Mr. Handy: "So once more I introduce him as the next President of the United States"—from which we infer that he had done it before and perchance many a time and oft.

The speaker paused, then sat. "Instantly," reports the newspapers, "every one of the 253 diners was on his feet waving either a small silk American flag or a [large cotton American] napkin." Mr. Bryan was obviously embarrassed. "His face was a study," instead of a map. "He seemed inclined both to frown and smile." He took a troche and cleared the way for a double-track mind.

"I hope," he began, ingratiatingly, "that you won't

treasure up against my friend Handy the political indiscretion which he has just committed." (Polite cough from the speaker and "we won't" from the back rows.) "He means well,"—awkward pause, not grasped at first, but finally responded to with either small silk American flags or large cotton American napkins,—“and it only shows how a habit he learned seventeen years ago becomes fixed.” Fixed? Glued, we should say. But let us not interrupt. This is important. “I believe,” Mr. Bryan continued diffidently if not indeed sadly, “that the toastmaster has the opinion of many others that my highest ambition was to become President of the United States.” Painful hesitation. Mr. Handy looked hurt. “THAT IS NOT SO. From my earliest manhood I have held a worthier and higher ambition. I have considered that office as only a means to an end. I consider no one worthy that high office who is not more interested in the things that can be accomplished through it than in the fame it brings.”

Wild Philadelphian applause. There was no longer any doubt of the essential truth. Never, from earliest manhood to second childhood, had Mr. Bryan wanted to be President, except, well as a means to an end—“our beings’ end and aim,” sang Mr. Pope. “I consider no one worthy,”—but pass that. “I am happy, and I want you all to believe me when I say so, to see those things so near to my heart being done by another, happier than if I were in his place.” Led by Mr. Handy, all expressed belief, conformably to request. Mr. Bryan then went on to say that under no circumstances would he become a candi— No, no, that is wrong; we were thinking of something Mr. Roosevelt said once upon a time. But it was a noble speech upon a noble theme, thoughtful, fairly temperate, generous, and kind.

As we read and ponder, our mind becomes troublous. In all candor we ask our considerate Chief Magistrate: Has Brother Bryan yet obtained all that is rightfully coming to him? He speaks of means and an end. That is well enough in a way. He is fond of both. But oughtn't he to be made President of something? Of course, there is the way blazed through the forest by himself in the Baltimore platform, but we have a feeling somehow that Time may obliterate single-term marks upon quickly growing trees.

Why not elect him President of Mexico? We learn from the Message that there is no government down there now

and that one is needed, as a matter of form. It could be done easily. Mr. John Lind, who seems to have nothing in particular on hand at the moment, could readily convert the gentle Mr. Zapata with his diplomatic artistry, and ex-Minister William Bayard Hale could direct a corps of trained San Domingo "observers" to note with interest the acutely painless methods of the kind Mr. Villa. Both, we understand, walk Spanish perfectly. And Mr. Bryan himself is a wonderful runner. A great ballot-getter, too! If our recollection is not at fault, he thrice obtained more votes for President of even this discriminating country than any other Democrat who ever ran, *bar none*. Six millions and more! Think of that and then consider how easily he could pick up the little twenty thousand votes which constitute an "election by the people" in Mexico! Nobody else is good enough to merit our recognition, anyway.

It is a splendid idea. If we could be assured that he would not request us to take it down at some inopportune moment, we should raise the standard forthwith:

FOR PRESIDENT

(Of Mexico)

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

Not Yet Tried, but True

COMMENT

ABOUT this time, you are likely to receive the following communication through the mails:

ANCIENT PRAYER

The following was sent to me and I send to you with directions received with it.

"O Lord, I implore thee to bless all mankind and to keep us from evil, and to take us to dwell with thee in eternity." This copy is an ancient prayer. Copy it and see what will happen. It is said in Jerusalem that those who receive the prayer and do not copy it meet with misfortune. But those who do copy it nine times, beginning with the day it is received, and send each day a copy to a friend, will on the ninth day receive some great joy or blessing and be delivered from all calamity. Make a wish when you write it.

It will bring you good luck.

Do not break the chain.

Do not sign.

It is anonymous, of course; neither the inventor nor the

sender of such an impertinence would care to invite well-merited rebuke. And yet we are informed that thousands of persons who regard themselves as devout Christians pass on the thing to irritated acquaintances. Some do it unthinkingly, no doubt, as a presumed religious service, others in the hope that they may really get something out of it, but the majority probably because they wish to take no chances. So they cravenly bow to the menace conveyed and help to perpetuate an idiotic superstition—all in the name of the Lord. The whole proceeding is immoral and insidiously subversive of true faith. Those who, knowing better, engage in it certainly need all the prayers they can get for their comfort in the hereafter, but meanwhile, on earth, they ought to be locked up.

“ C-543 ” is not, as one might readily suspect, a torpedo-boat destroyer; it is a hen, whose exploits must not pass unchronicled. The statistician from whose account we derive the facts set forth below informs us that she “was hatched” on April 29th, 1912, in the Oregon Agricultural College. We accept without question the date and place of first appearance. Ordinarily, too, we would not cavil at the assertion that a chicken was hatched; but this was no ordinary chicken, as presently will be seen. The privilege of being born at least might have been accorded her. Indeed, in view of the fact that the epoch-making event took place in Oregon, we are disposed to think that “made her Initiative” would savor more strongly of appropriateness. But let us not haggle over trifles. The overpowering point in history is that C-543 has broken all records. At the early age of five months and fourteen days she—surely “it,” applied to such a hen, is a sad reproach, if not indeed an insult—began to lay and in one short year presented the students of the college with 283 eggs. Needless to say, the feat is unparalleled, although due credit should not be withheld from another collegiate hen, an own cousin, we understand, of C-543, who in 1912 produced 282. We can easily imagine the tenseness of feeling in the Oregon Agricultural College on the last day of the twelfth month while the professors and students were awaiting the arrival of the 283d. But the deliverance was successful, and both C-543 and egg are said to be doing well. We respectfully suggest that a degree be

conferred upon C-543 and that at the conclusion of the ceremony the President of the college summon to the stage the illustrious originator of the Initiative and say to him: U'Ren.

At last we have an incorruptible Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. McAdoo made the fact known on December 3d, when he gave out for publication a letter from an unnamed, but obviously unoriginal, Wilson man, reading as follows:

Mr. McAdoo, if you will appoint me as revenue collector I will make you a present of one-third of my first year's wages. I will give you \$100 just as soon as appointed, and the rest just as soon as I can have a public sale.

The Secretary spurned the proposition. "There is no place for you in the Treasury Department," he wrote in reply. "Such an offer as this shows your unfitness for public office or public trust of any kind. The best service I can render to you is to advise you to revise your moral standard." And he added, scathingly:

I am grieved to discover that there is any man in the United States who seems to think that there is neither moral turpitude nor impropriety in making an offer of this sort.

You do not seem to realize that the era of graft and corruption in American politics is past.

What a relief it is to know that the wicked old days when Alexander Hamilton, Roger B. Taney, Salmon P. Chase, John Sherman, William Windom, John G. Carlisle, George B. Cortelyou, and Franklin Mac Veagh used to accept a hundred on account for collectorships are past and gone. But kindly imagine one of those mentioned publishing a thing like that "in order," as the *Evening Post* remarks, "to demonstrate the Roman virtue of this Administration"!

The new Senator from Oregon contributes this admirable autobiography to the *Congressional Directory*:

Harry Lane, Democrat, of Oregon. Term expires March 3, 1919.

"I feel perfectly at home here," he remarked, at the end of his first month in Washington. "I used to be Superintendent of the Oregon Insane Asylum." But there is a difference. He is an *inmate* of the Senate.

What has become of the Honorable William C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce and high priest of trade?—*Philadelphia Press*.

Nothing has become of him; nothing *could* become of him. But when last seen he was consulting Secretary of Labor (Unions) Wilson and the Honorable Jay Hamilton Lewis concerning the practicability of enhancing power facilities by ordering water to run uphill.

And it may be another detail which, in his present powerful position, Mr. Wilson had forgotten, but had this primary system prevailed in the summer of 1912 the nomination of the Democratic party would almost surely have gone to the Hon. Champ Clark.—*New York Times*.

Well?

From the Associated Press:

TOPEKA, KAN., Dec. 6.—At the annual banquet of the State Democratic Club on January 5, W. J. Bryan will be the principal speaker. For this purpose 250 gallons of grape-juice have been ordered.

Does he bathe in it?

Incidentally we may ask: Why this proposal now? Hasn't the Democratic party enough trouble on its hands?—*The Evening Sun*.

No; only a cold in its head, when the suffragettes come around.

Young Bryan for Politics.—*Headline in the Times*.

Oh, for goodness' sake!